IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

SIERRA CLUB,)	
Plaintiff,)	No. 6:13-cv-00356-JHP
v.)	Judge James H. Payne
OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY,)	
Defendant.)	

OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(a), Defendant Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company ("OG&E"), by and through its attorneys, respectfully moves for summary judgment on the remaining claim in Plaintiff Sierra Club's Complaint. OG&E moves for summary judgment on the following grounds:

- 1. The State of Oklahoma and OG&E have already litigated and resolved the remaining claim that Sierra Club now seeks to assert in this case. Sierra Club is therefore precluded from trying to litigate it again before this Court.
- 2. In the previous case, OG&E and the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality ("ODEQ") entered into a consent order specifically addressing the opacity emissions at Muskogee Unit 6. The consent order precludes Sierra Club from asserting a claim relating to opacity emissions occurring prior to the entry of the consent order because the order—by its very terms—resolved those claims.

- 3. Sierra Club also cannot assert a claim for opacity emissions occurring after the entry of the consent order because the order continues to impose compliance obligations on OG&E, and the evidence shows that OG&E is meeting those requirements.
- 4. The evidence also shows that OG&E meets the particulate matter emissions limit in its permit using the test methods prescribed by the permit. By law, no other evidence of particulate matter emissions can be considered in this proceeding.
- 5. To the extent Sierra Club wants to use opacity information to demonstrate particulate matter emission limit exceedances, it is unable to do so because of the consent order, and because opacity information simply does not prove an exceedance of the particulate matter emissions limit.
- 6. There is no genuine issue of material fact as to Sierra Club's remaining claim. Accordingly, summary judgment for OG&E is required.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, and those set forth in the attached Brief in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment, OG&E respectfully requests that this Court grant its Motion for Summary Judgment.

Date: May 21, 2014

Respectfully Submitted,

s/ Brian J. Murray

Brian J. Murray
bjmurray@jonesday.com
Charles T. Wehland
ctwehland@jonesday.com
JONES DAY
77 West Wacker Drive, Suite 3500
Chicago, Illinois 60601-1692
Telephone: (312) 782-3939
Facsimile: (312) 782-8585

Donald K. Shandy (OBA No. 11511)
DShandy@ryanwhaley.com
Patrick R. Pearce, Jr. (OBA No. 18802)
RPearce@ryanwhaley.com
RYAN WHALEY COLDIRON SHANDY
PLLC
119 N. Robinson Avenue, Ste 900
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
Telephone: (405) 239-6040
Fax: (405) 239-6766

Counsel for Defendant Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on May 21, 2014 I electronically transmitted the attached Motion for Summary Judgment to the Clerk of Court using the ECF System for filing. Based on the records currently on file, the Clerk of Court will transmit a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:

Jacquelyn Dill DILL LAW FIRM, PC 12101 N MacArthur Blvd, Ste 200 Oklahoma City, OK 73162 (405) 722-9600 Fax: (405) 694-4568 jdill@dillawfirm.com

David C. Bender McGillivray Westerberg & Bender 211 S Paterson, Ste 320 Madison, WI 53703 (608) 310-3560 Fax: (608) 310-3561

> s/ Brian J. Murray Brian J. Murray